



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and thus to promote stable government. His proposal was allowed to die.

President Harding's proclamation follows:

Whereas Section I of a joint resolution of Congress, entitled a "Joint resolution to prohibit the exportation of arms or munitions of war from the United States to certain countries, and for other purposes," approved January 31, 1922, provides as follows:

"That whenever the President finds that in any American country, or in any country in which the United States exercises extraterritorial jurisdiction, conditions of domestic violence exist, which are or may be promoted by the use of arms or munitions of war procured from the United States, and makes proclamation thereof, it shall be unlawful to export, except under such limitations and exceptions as the President prescribes, any arms or munitions of war from any place in the United States to such country until otherwise ordered by the President or by Congress."

And whereas, it is provided by Section II of the said joint resolution that "whoever exports any arms or munitions of war in violation of Section I shall, on conviction, be punished by fine not exceeding \$10,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding two years, or both":

Now, therefore, I, Warren G. Harding, President of the United States of America, acting under and by virtue of the authority conferred on me by the said joint resolution of Congress, do hereby declare and proclaim that I have found that there exist in China such conditions of domestic violence which are or may be promoted by the use of arms or munitions of war procured from the United States as contemplated by the said joint resolution; and I do hereby admonish all citizens of the United States and every person to abstain from every violation of the provisions of the joint resolution above set forth, hereby made applicable to China, and I do hereby warn them that all violations of such provisions will be rigorously prosecuted.

And I do hereby enjoin upon all officers of the United States, charged with the execution of the laws thereof, the utmost diligence in preventing violations of the said joint resolution and this my proclamation issued thereunder, and in bringing to trial and punishment any offenders against the same.

And I do hereby delegate to the Secretary of State the power of prescribing exceptions and limitations to the application of the said joint resolution of January 31, 1922, as made effective by this my proclamation issued thereunder.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this fourth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-two and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-sixth.

WARREN G. HARDING.

By the President:

[SEAL.] HENRY P. FLETCHER,  
Acting Secretary of State.

## WHAT IS IN THE MINDS OF STUDENTS

Not the least impressive of the many group expressions on the work of the Conference on the Limitation of Armaments was the statement of the views of men and women students in 235 universities and colleges, which was presented to President Harding on February 20 by Charles Denby, Jr., Princeton, chairman of a committee representing the National Student Committee for the Limitation of Armaments.

In presenting the statement to the President, Mr. Denby made the observation that those who would be called upon to serve in war and who have willingly responded to call in the past are eager to help in the elimination of future wars.

The students' statement follows:

In view of the fact that the United States has assumed an active part in the attempt to solve some of the problems

involved in effecting international peace, the students of America have felt incumbent upon them the obligations of crystallizing their opinions concerning the problems that confronted the Conference for the Limitation of Armaments at Washington.

To stimulate interest in and discussion of these problems, the National Student Committee for the Limitation of Armaments was organized. Through co-operation between the students of 235 colleges and universities and this National Student Committee, collegiate opinion has been roused and formulated by means of debates, mass meetings, and publicity in the college press.

The following expressions of opinion are based on resolutions independently adopted by a large part of the colleges and universities.

1. It is believed that the series of treaties drawn by the Washington Conference should be expeditiously ratified in their entirety by the United States Senate because they are definite steps toward the limitation of armaments by international agreement and are indicative of a genuine tendency toward international understanding and co-operation, and because a failure to ratify these treaties would result in augmented distrust among nations.

2. In addition, the students of America commend the spirit which prompted Mr. Wilson to propose the League of Nations and the similar spirit which moved Mr. Harding to call the Washington Conference because it manifests a not distant possibility of an organization of nations adequately prepared peaceably to adjust international difficulties.

3. Furthermore, the students are of the opinion that the United States should participate in the Genoa or some similar conference on condition that the agenda include balancing the budgets of European countries, reduction of land armaments, breaking down of economic barriers, and German reparations. It is further anticipated that such a conference will lead to the adoption of policies by which in the future international welfare will predominate over purely national interests in the conduct of international economic affairs.

## A DEFENSE OF SOVIET RUSSIA'S BUDGET

In the February 15 issue of the *Russian Information and Review*, a new publication put out by the information department of the Russian trade delegation in London, is a statement of the Soviet Government's budget for the first nine months of the current year and a comparison with the 1910 budget of the Tsarist Government. It has interest as a statement of the Soviet case by Soviet spokesmen, and is reprinted as a contribution to the general fund of information upon one of the world's most difficult problems. The statement follows:

Details of the Russian State budget for the first nine months of 1922 are now available and make it possible to draw comparisons with Tsarist budgets. As already explained, the current budget is for a period of nine months only, from January 1 to September 30, 1922.

Further, in order to secure definite monetary values throughout the estimates, all receipts and expenditure have been converted into their equivalents in pre-war values, so that fluctuations in the values of the Soviet rouble will not affect the budget.

The budget totals are:

Expenditure .....	1,878,000,000 gold roubles
Revenue .....	1,648,000,000 gold roubles

Deficit..... 230,000,000 gold roubles

The estimated revenue is therefore 87.7 per cent of the expenditure and the deficit, which will be met by note issues, is only 12.3 per cent. This deficit is comparatively small if the financial position of all of the European countries affected by the war is considered. From the time of the

first decision of the Soviet Government to change its economic policy, it was realized that every effort must be made to stabilize the value of the rouble, and that, therefore, the government must restrict note issues as far as possible. The present budget shows that a great advance in this direction has been made; and although, owing to the difficult economic position, it has not been possible to make the budget balance this year, the government is confident that, if peace throughout the year can be assured, and if this year's harvest is moderately good, the budget for 1922-23 will mark the end of the issues of paper currency to meet deficits.

Turning now to the details of the budget, we find the following estimates of expenditure for the various commissariats, &c. We also give the expenditure of corresponding state departments in the Tsarist budget of 1910. The figures throughout are in millions of gold roubles, and the percentage of the total expenditure for the year is also given in each case.

Various conclusions may be drawn from these figures. Perhaps the most important at the moment are those connected with "bureaucracy." It has often been stated that the Soviet machinery of government is bureaucratic and costly. The figures disprove these assertions. The purely political and juridical side of government, consisting of the Central Executive Committee, the Council of People's Commissaries, and the Commissariats for the Interior and for Justice, will cost 88.7 million, whereas the Tsarist Court and Council with the Ministries for Home Affairs and Justice cost in 1910 over 227,000,000—between two and a half and three times as much.

The Soviet Government has established various organs for social betterment, such as the Commissariats for Health and Social Welfare, which the Tsarist Government did not consider necessary. The Soviet Government is also spending 50 per cent more on education than the Tsarist Government. The high cost of military and naval establishments is due to the fact that Russia still has to face the hostility of the neighboring States. The Polish invasion of 1920, the continued Japanese occupation of Vladivostok and the eastern seaboard of Siberia, and the frontier raids from Rumania, Poland, and Finland during the last few months make it impossible for Russia to disarm as completely as the Russian Government hopes to be able to do if the powers adopt a more friendly and more stable policy toward Russia.

The only other important item of expenditure is economic, an item which is present in the estimates of most of the commissariats, but against which have to be set the receipts from nationalized industry which are dealt with below.

With regard to the estimated revenue for the nine months covered by the budget, we give below a general analysis, with corresponding figures for the Tsarist budget of 1910, in millions of gold roubles:

## *Analysis of Revenue, Budgets of 1910 and 1922 (Nine Months)*

	1910.	1922.
Taxes and customs duties.....	979 34%	75 4%
Government monopolies, &c.....	1,662 59%	.. ..
Transport, posts, telegraphs.....	.. ..	99 5%
Timber .....	.. ..	78 4%
State industry, &c.....	.. ..	903 48%
Food tax, &c.....	.. ..	426 23%
Various .....	139 5%	66 4%
Deficit—met by note issues....	50 2%	230 12%

The main source of revenue in the Tsarist budgets was the government monopoly of vodka; in the Soviet budget the main sources are the products of State industry and the food tax. In the following table we give the details of the receipts from the more important industries; the last column shows the percentage relation of the estimated output for the nine months of 1922 to the 1912 output:

Industry.	Nine months 1922 in million gold roubles.	Percentage of 1912 output.
Timber .....	78.0	59
Coal, oil, peat.....	159.0	58
Other mining (gold, salt, ores, &c.) .....	16.7	15
Metal and electrical.....	139.0	26
Textiles .....	149.2	17
Chemical .....	49.8	20
Mineral manufactures.....	11.6	10
Cotton .....	6.9	10
Leather .....	93.6	11
Food-stuffs .....	87.1	21
Sugar refineries .....	19.2	9

These figures show how far the output is secondary industries, dependent on fuel and raw material, transport and machinery, has fallen in comparison with the simpler businesses of getting timber, coal, and oil. The latter are worth nearly 60 per cent of the pre-war output, but the manufacture of textiles, chemicals, bricks, and sugar, for example, have fallen on an average to something like 15 per cent of the 1912 totals. The output of fuel has already risen

considerably, and the estimated output for 1922, if fully achieved, would make available more fuel than is needed for transport and manufactures at their present level. An ample fuel supply will react in turn upon the state of transport, which now hampers industry very considerably. It will, however, be impossible for Russia, if not helped by credits from abroad, to do more than widen, very slowly, the vicious circle of worn-out transport and starved factories that are unable, because of the difficulty of carrying to them sufficient fuel, raw material, and food for the workers, to do much to help in building up the railways again. If this vicious circle is broken in 1922 by outside help, the Russian budget for 1923 will be an even more hopeful sign of the possibility of restoring Europe than the budget for the present year.

## PEACE WORKERS IN WAR TIMES

### Some Self-Explanatory Correspondence

In a magazine called *Unity*, under date of January 19, 1922, the Rev. Charles Francis Dole took occasion to pay his respects to the ADVOCATE OF PEACE and to the American Peace Society as follows:

#### PEACE SOCIETIES AND WAR

The December issue of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE tells its readers in one of its editorial articles that the American Peace Society "has stood by the United States Government in all its wars of over a century!" Is not this an extraordinary record for the oldest peace society in the land? Do they really mean *all* the wars? The infamous Mexican War? The wars with our Indian tribes? The little wars, as with Mexico and in the West Indies, that President Wilson had engaged us in, while he was supposed to be "keeping us out of War"? Did the American Peace Society really stand by our government in the prosecution of the Spanish War, and afterwards in conquering the Philippine Islands? What is the use of such a peace society as that! Let us in charity give the editor the chance to make, if he truthfully can, at least some modification of this scandalous history of supporting the government through all wars, "thick and thin," good and bad.

Has any great cause of humanity ever been served as feebly as the cause for which peace societies exist? When no war is going on, the friends of peace have nothing special to do, except genially to hope that there will never be another war to disturb them. Of course, other people can see no reason to attend peace meetings when the friends of peace show no concern in the subject. But when the challenge of war comes, and there might be something to do, at least in opposing a "wicked" war, that modern Temple of Janus, the peace society, is closed, and nothing is doing till the dull time of peace returns and there is nothing to do! Did the anti-slavery movement proceed by such indifferent conduct as this? No! It began with John Woolman, traveling down into the slaving-holding colonies and having heart-to-heart talks with the slave-owners. And it went on till hundreds of thousands of people were proclaiming slavery as an intolerable sin. So with the movement against the alcoholic drinks. Millions of men were converted to swear the oath, "*Carthago delenda est*," against these drinks.

The ADVOCATE OF PEACE goes on to indulge in prophecy. It says: "Should a situation like unto that of 1917 once more arise, this society would undoubtedly stand by its government again." We call this melancholy. Have these friends of peace learned nothing out of the horrible seven years just passed? Has no ray of light penetrated their minds that the churches and colleges and peace societies of America may have made a colossal mistake in supporting the war! Can they not see that wars go on, following one another, because the governmental and military group reckon on ex-

actly this state of mind among church leaders and "friends of peace," which this pathetic paragraph voices, presuming that the good people will always help win the war? Suppose the time when the government becomes aware that the churches, or one-tenth part of them, would stick to their job of proclaiming the brotherhood of mankind, and would die, as soldiers die, rather than forsake their faith and kill their brothers, what government on earth would dare to begin a war in the face of such opposition? What is the use of a peace society, after such a war as we have seen, that goes out of its way to promise the government that it may *always* rely upon its support in carrying on war?

CHARLES F. DOLE.

Our attention was first called to Dr. Dole's article by a letter, under date of January 30, from Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead, of Boston, who wrote:

To the Editor of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

DEAR SIR: I was amazed to see your editorial statement that the American Peace Society has stood by the United States Government in all its wars for over a century.

I was a director of the American Peace Society for twelve years, including the period of the Spanish War and the Philippine aftermath. This was not true as regards that war, as you will see by consulting back numbers of the ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

As to the Mexican War, the President of the Society, Wm. Jay, was opposed to it, and I think you will find that the back numbers testify to that very forcibly.

I have just read the enclosed clipping from *Unity*, by Rev. Chas. F. Dole, which I beg that you will publish, together with my own communication.

Yours sincerely,

LUCIA AMES MEAD.

Under date of February 1, we wrote to Mrs. Mead the following letter, a copy of which was sent to Dr. Dole:

MRS. LUCIA AMES MEAD,

19 Euston Street, Brookline, Mass.

MY DEAR MRS. MEAD:

You and Mr. C. F. Dole seem to enjoy criticizing the ADVOCATE OF PEACE more, we fear, than the ADVOCATE OF PEACE is able to profit by the criticism. The ADVOCATE OF PEACE says many things during the year, but it receives no word of commendation from either of you. It appears that you are concerned primarily, for some reason, to hunt out those things which you can speak of unfavorably. If only you could see your way clear to take, rather, the concrete and important things for which we have definitely and openly stood through a century, criticize them, and show wherein they are wrong or how they could be improved; you would render a more promising service to the thing which you and the rest of us are trying as best we can to promote.

The fact is that the American Peace Society exists for the purpose of ending war as a means of settling international disputes. That has been its aim from the outset. It is its aim now. When that aim ceases the American Peace Society will cease. The American Peace Society, faced with an America threatened by the onrush of a European war power in 1917, took the position that the clarion, unmistakable call to every one of us in America was to end the war by winning it. That was, we believe, the position of sanity then. Granted the same conditions again, the American Peace Society would, we hope, take the same ground. The American Peace Society never has been a non-resistant society. Non-resistant officials have been connected with its work, but they have never tried to make the Society non-resistant. During the Civil War the American Peace Society stood by the central government. It was opposed to the Mexican War; it was opposed to the Civil War; it was opposed to the Spanish War; it was opposed to the last war; it is and always has been opposed to all war. It sprang from the opposition to war. But if in our ungoverned world American institutions, the life of America, be threatened by some nation or group of nations faring forth to war, the American Peace Society should be no traitor to the glory